Exhibit 2

The Court has received the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement ("Stipulation"), entered into by and between (1) plaintiffs Zachary Hile and Shogher Andonian ("Plaintiffs" or "Class Representatives"), on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated (the "Class"), and (2) defendant Ritz Camera Centers, Inc. ("Defendant"). The Court, having reviewed the Stipulation and the exhibits attached thereto and the papers submitted in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and good cause appearing, HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. The Court, for purposes of this order (the "Order"), adopts all defined terms as set forth in the Stipulation;
- 2. The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement based upon the terms set forth in the Stipulation. The Settlement appears to be fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Class;
- 3. The Court orders that the following Settlement Class is preliminarily certified for settlement purposes only: All individual consumers in the United States of America who, between December 4, 2006 and April 9, 2007, used a credit or debit card for a transaction at a Ritz Camera Centers Location and were provided at the point of sale or transaction with an electronically-printed receipt which displayed (1) more than the last five digits of the credit or debit card number, and/or (2) the expiration date of the credit or debit card;
- 4. The Court finds that the above-defined Class meets all the requirements for class certification. The Court further finds that the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(2) are satisfied as (a) the Class Members are so numerous that joinder is impracticable, (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Class Members which predominate over any individual questions, (c) the claims of the Class Representatives are typical of the claims of the Class Members, (d) the Class Representatives and their counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interests of the Class Members and will continue to do so, and (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy;
- 5. The Court appoints Eric A. Grover of Keller Grover LLP, Mark R. Thierman of Thierman Law Firm, Scott A. Miller of Law Offices of Scott A. Miller, A.P.C., Steven L. Miller

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

l	Case 1:08-cv-00453
	Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA Document 35 Filed 04/21/2008 Page 5 of 5
1	23. Each Class Member who wishes to object to the fairness, reasonableness or
2	adequacy of the Stipulation, to any terms of the proposed Settlement, or to the proposed
3	Attorneys' Fees and Costs, must submit a written objection to the Claims Administrator within
4	forty-five (45) days after the date the last Published Notice appears;
5	24. Pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, Defendant is required to notify
6	"appropriate Federal and State officials" of the settlement. 28 U.S.C. § 1715. If such
7	notifications have not been made at the time of this Order, the Defendant must do so within ten
8	(10) court days and file proof of such notification with the Court within fifteen (15) court days of
9	the date of this Order.
10	25. All proceedings in the Action are stayed until further order of the Court, except as
11	may be necessary to implement the Settlement or comply with the terms of the Stipulation or this
12	Order.
13	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.
15	
16	DATE:, 2008 Honorable Saundra B. Armstrong
17	Judge of the United States District Court, Northern District
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	-5-
	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL Case No. 07-716 SBA

Exhibit 3

Document 31-3

Filed 04/28/2008

Case 1:08-cv-00453

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Good cause appearing, the Court HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. The Court, for purposes of this order (the "Order"), adopts all defined terms as set forth in the Stipulation;
- 2. The Court approves the settlement as set forth in the Stipulation as fair, reasonable and adequate to the Settlement Class within the meaning of Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;
- The Court hereby approves and orders that the total amount of \$765,000.00 is the 3. amount of reasonable attorneys' fees that should be paid to Class Counsel for the work completed and to be completed and orders reimbursement of costs in the amount of \$18,000.00, and hereby authorizes payment of said amounts in accordance with the Stipulation. The Court further orders that the attorneys' fee award set forth in this paragraph shall be administered pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation;
- The Court hereby approves and orders incentive payments to plaintiffs Zachary Hile 4. and Shogher Andonian in the amount of \$1,000 each as compensation for their work and efforts on behalf of the Class;
- The Court dismisses the Complaints on the merits and with prejudice and, except 5. as approved by the Court and provided herein, without costs or attorneys' fees to either of the Settling Parties;
- 6. The Court adjudges that the Settling Plaintiffs have released any and all claims against the Settling Defendant as set forth in Paragraph 1.17 of the Stipulation;
- 7. The Court permanently enjoins all Settling Plaintiffs from filing, prosecuting or otherwise pursuing any and all Settled Claims against the Settling Defendant;
- 8. The Court permanently enjoins Settlement Class Plaintiffs and members of the Settlement Class who made a purchase at a Ritz Camera Centers Location during the Relevant Time Period using a credit card or debit card and who received a receipt containing more than the last five digits of the credit card or debit card number and/or the expiration date of the credit or debit card who reside in jurisdictions in which the Published Notice was published, in which

١	Case 1:08-cv-00453 Document 31-3 Filed 04/28/2008 Page 10 of 20			
	Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA Document 34 Filed 04/21/2008 Page 3 of 3			
1	the In-Store Notice was displayed, or in which the On-Line Notice was accessible, and who did			
2	not either Opt-Out or raise any proper written objection to the proposed settlement terms on or			
3	before the Opt-Out Expiration Date either in person, directly or through legal counsel, or in			
4	writing from filing, prosecuting or otherwise pursuing any appeal of the Final Judgment, to the			
5	extent permitted by law;			
6	9. Because there is no just reason for delay, the Court directs that the clerk of the			
7	Court enter the Final Judgment forthwith as a final judgment pursuant to Rules 54(b) and 58 of			
8	the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; and			
9	10. Without affecting the finality of the Final Judgment, the Court reserves continuing			
10	jurisdiction over the Settling Parties for the purposes of: (a) implementation of the settlement set			
11	forth in this Stipulation; and (b) enforcing and administering the settlement and any Court orders			
12	relating to the settlement.			
13				
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
15	DATE. 2008			
16	DATE:, 2008 Honorable Saundra B. Armstrong			
17	Judge of the United States District Court, Northern District			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	-3- [PROPOSED] FINAL HIDGMENT AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREMIDISE			
	[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE Case No. 07-716 SBA			

Exhibit 4

Case 1:08-cv-00453

Document 31-3

Filed 04/28/2008

Page 12 of 20

including Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer. The statements contained in this Declaration are made from my personal knowledge and from my review of documents prepared in the ordinary course of business by RCCI employees under my general supervision and direction; if called as a witness in these proceedings, I could and would testify competently to each of the matters set forth herein.

- 2. Based upon information I have reviewed from records of RCCI prepared and maintained in the ordinary course of business, I confirm the representation made in the Stipulation of Settlement herein that between December 4, 2006 and April 9, 2007, at its U.S. retail outlets selling cameras, lenses, digital memory products, imaging products and services, RCCI printed approximately 2.55 million credit card and debit card receipts displaying a card expiration date. These receipts were issued to approximately 1.7 million different consumers, some of whom received more than one receipt. By April 9, 2007, all RCCI locations were fully FACTA-compliant.
- 3. Based upon information I have reviewed from records of RCCI prepared and maintained in the ordinary course of business, I confirm the representation made in the Stipulation of Settlement herein that more than 80% of the total sales in 2006 at U.S. retail outlets of RCCI selling cameras, lenses, digital memory products, imaging products and services encompass and are of the sale of those products. Further, and also based on RCCI's 2006 sales at these outlets, I confirm that more than 80% of all camera, lens and digital memory sales fall within parameters in the Stipulation of Settlement that would allow the proposed

Filed 04/21/2008

Page 3 of 9

Settlement Package Award Certificate and Supplemental Award Certificate to be used in such sales transactions.

- 4. With respect to notice to members of the proposed Settlement Class, since November 2006, prior to the time period relevant to this litigation, RCCI has not collected street addresses or postal mailing addresses from its customers. RCCI has no means to gather names and street addresses or postal mailing addresses of individual members of the proposed Settlement Class. Whether financial institutions who issued credit cards or debit cards used by customers in transactions at RCCI outlets between December 4, 2006 and April 9, 2007, could or would provide names and addresses for those customers is unknown to RCCI; attempting to assemble the individual names and addresses for 1.7 million customers would undoubtedly involve huge amounts of time and significant expenditure by such financial institutions and the parties, far more than reasonable effort, without assurance the process can be accomplished in a reasonable time.
- 5. RCCI has, for many years, advertised frequently and regularly with printed inserts in the Sunday editions of newspapers and customary weekly advertising publications of such newspapers (collectively, "Insert Publications") in the major metropolitan areas of the United States. In my observation and experience, these printed insert advertisements have been the principal means for communication between RCCI and its customers. The newspapers in which RCCI regularly advertises with inserts in Insert Publications, along with their reported circulation and headquarters cities, are as follows:

Paper Name	Headquarters	Circulation of RCCI Inserts
Atlanta Journal	Atlanta, GA	866,000
		3

(Case 1:08-cv-00453 Doc	cument 31-3	Filed 04/28/2008	Page 15 of 20	
•	Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA	Document 31	Filed 04/21/2008	Page 4 of 9	
1	Austin American Statesmar	Austin, TX	87,830		
2	Baltimore Examiner	M 111			
3	Daiminole Examiner	Baltimore, MD	178,837		
4	Potting Co.				
5	Baltimore Sun	Baltimore, MD	208,610		
6	Birmingham News	Birmingham, AL	- 85,291		
7	_				
8	Boston Globe	Boston, MA	546,575		
9	Charleston Post & Courier	Charleston, SC	112,295		
10			112,233		
11	Charlotte Observer	Charlotte, NC	141,300		
12	Chattanooga Times Free Press	Chattanooga,	00 272		
13	F1033	TN	90,373		
14	Chicago Tribune	Chiongo II	050 500		
15		Chicago, IL	958,500		
16					
17 18	Cincinnati Enquirer	Cincinnati, OH	307,259		
19	Cleveland Plain Dealer				
20	Columbia State	Cleveland, OH 131,416	319,977 145,000		
21			1-101000		
22	Dallas Morning News	Dallas, TX	570,000		
23	Denver Post	Denver, CO	508,730		
24		·	506,73U		
25	Detroit News and Free Press	Detroit, MI	160,253		
26	Ft. Lauderdale Sun Sentinel	Ft. Lauderdale, FL	550,000		
27		í L			
28			4		
Ì					

С	ase 1:08-cv-00453 Doc	ument 31-3 F	iled 04/28/2008	Page 16 of 20
i	Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA	Document 31	Filed 04/21/2008	Page 5 of 9
1	Ft. Worth Star Telegram	E4 Monday TM	477	
2	i i vvoiti otal Telegram	Ft. Worth, TX	175,630	
3				
4	Greenville News-Piedmont	Greenville, NC	119,000	
5			110,000	
6	Hartford Course			
7	Hartford Courant	Hartford, CT	240,559	
8	Houston Chronicle	Houston, TX	359,746	
9	1			
10	Kansas City Star	Kansas City, MO	254,730	
11	Kingsport Times-News	Vincencel Th	40.000	
12	Milyopoit Hilles-News	Kingsport, TN	48,000	
13	Los Angeles Times	Los Angeles, CA	844,093	
14				
15	Manchester Union Leader	Manchester, NH	54,108	
16			·	
17	Memphis Commercial Appeal	Memphis, TN	165,716	
18				
19	Miami Herald	Miami, FL	189,000	
20				
21	Milwaukee Journal	Milwaukee, WI	218,876	
22				
23			•	
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
20			5	

С	ase 1:08-cv-00453 Doc	ument 31-3 Fi	led 04/28/2008	Page 17 of 20
1	Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA	Document 31	Filed 04/21/2008	Page 6 of 9
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Minneapolis Star Tribune	Minneapolis, MN	507,160	
10	Nashville Tennessean	Nashville, TN	200,000	
11			200,000	
12	Norfolk Virginian Pilot	Norfolk, VA	144,675	
13 14	Orlando Sentinel	Orlando, FL	208,400	
15				
16 17 18	Philadelphia Inquirer	Philadelphia, PA	651,000	
19 20	Phoenix Arizona Republic	Phoenix, AZ	369,917	
21	Pittsburgh Post Gazette	Pittsburgh, PA	294,960	
22	Portland Oregonian	Portland, OR	300,000	
23				
24				N
25				
26				
27				
28			6	
	Case No. CV-07-00716 SBA			

С	ase 1:08-cv-00453 Doc	ument 31-3 F	Filed 04/28/2008	Page 18 of 20	
i	Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA	Document 31	Filed 04/21/2008	Page 7 of 9	
4					
1					
2					
3					
4	Providence Journal	Providence, RI	219,769		
5					
6					
7					
8	Raleigh News & Observer	Raleigh, NC	186,590		
9					
10	Richmond Times Dispatch	Richmond, VA	142,888		
11	Disputoi,	Monitoria, 47	142,000		
12	Sacramento Bee	0			
13	Saciamento Dee	Sacramento, CA	225,418		
14	Salt Lake City Tribune	Salt Lake City, UT	127,395		
15	San Antonio Express News	San Antonio, TX	125,386		
16	San Diego Union Tribune	San Diego, CA	318,848		
17		= 1= 3 =, = 11	3 (0,0)0		
18		San Francisco,			
19	San Francisco Chronicle	CA	364,900		
20					
21					
22	San Francisco Examiner	San Francisco,	244.004		
23	Carry rancisco Examino	CA	244,034		
24					
25					
26					
27					
28			7		
	Case No. CV-07-00716 SBA				

	Case 1:08-cv-00453 Doo	cument 31-3	Filed 04/28/2008	Page 19 of 20
•	Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA	Document 31	Filed 04/21/2008	Page 8 of 9
1				
2	San Jose Mercury News	San lone OA		
3		San Jose, CA	264,486	
4	Ų.			
5	Sarasota Herald-Tribune	Sarasota, FL	105,990	
6	Seattle Times	Seattle, WA	385,000	
7				
8	St Louis Post Dispatch	St. Louis, MO	85,266	
9	Ĭ.			
10		St. Paul, MN	85,266	
11	St. Petersburg Times	St. Petersburg, FL	285,000	
12				
13	Tampa Tribune	Tampa Fi		
14		Tampa, FL	126,469	
15				
16				
17 18	Washington Examiner	Washington, DC	45D 44F	
19		vidolinigion, DO	158,445	
20				
21				
22	Washington Post	Washington, DC	1,002,300	
23				
24				
25				
26			*	
27				
28			8	
		Casa No. CV	0.00	

Case 4:07-cv-00716-SBA Document 31 Filed 04/21/2008 Page 9 of 9

1 2

- 6. The publication of an insert in the Insert Publications of each of the above-listed newspapers will reach, according to the most recent information reported to RCCI, approximately 11.4 million newspaper subscribers and customers. RCCI will publish notice, as approved by this Court pursuant to the present Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, in inserts in the Insert Publications of the above-listed newspapers on two separate Sundays (for Sunday editions) and in two separate weeklies (for weekly advertising publications), for a total of approximately 23 million inserts.
- 7. From my observation and experience of RCCI sales and store locations and my review of information from records maintained by RCCI in the ordinary course of business, I confirm that more than 85 percent (85%) of RCCI's total sales of cameras, lenses, digital memory products, imaging products and services are made within the circulation areas of the above-listed newspapers. I further confirm that more than 85 percent (85%) of RCCI's retail outlets where these products are sold are located within the circulation areas of the above-listed newspapers.

Executed under penalty of perjury under the laws of Maryland and the United States this 24 day of April, 2008.

Curtis J. Scheel

5245806_v1